

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING**  
**JANUARY 16, 1997**

PROJECTS REVIEWED

Arboretum Master Plan  
Sakuma View Point Park  
Stone View Village  
Washington State Trade and Convention Center Expansion

Convened: 8:00 AM

Adjourned: 4:00 PM

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

Barbara Swift, Chair  
Moe Batra  
Carolyn Darwish  
Gail Dubrow  
Robert Foley  
Gerald Hansmire  
Jon Layzer  
Rick Sundberg

STAFF PRESENT

Marcia Wagoner  
Vanessa Murdock  
Michael Read

011697.1            Project: **ARBORETUM MASTER PLAN**  
                         Phase: Update  
                         Presenters: Woody Wilkenson, Department of Parks and Recreation  
                         Time: 1.25 hours (0.3%)

The proposed arboretum master plan addresses the growth and maintenance of the species collections as well as the management of and service to the visitors of the arboretum. Currently many of the rare and exotic species within the arboretum are dying, as the larger trees are crowding the smaller species. In addition, the arboretum is not presently well organized in terms of visitor circulation and species identification. The trail system is not readily understandable, and does not provide adequate access to the extent of the collection. A vision team consisting of 5 directors of other arboreta provided insights into important issues relevant to the master plan. Future plantings will be based upon plant associations in response to hydrologic and geologic conditions. Security, traffic, noise and wayfinding were identified as the significant visitor concerns. The master plan has addressed the visitor issues in the following ways. Arboretum Way is proposed to be closed to vehicular traffic, parking will be concentrated in larger parking areas to provide more casual surveillance, the pathways will be reconfigured and more clearly marked. In addition, the collection will be arranged in a manner that follows the natural systems of the area. The re-introduction of a creek through the arboretum has also been discussed. A recreational bike path is proposed alongside Lake Washington Boulevard. A concession area close to the south entry is proposed.

### **Discussion**

- Batra:** I have lived in Seattle for the past 35 years and have received information today on the Arboretum that I never before knew. Regarding your recommendation to close Arboretum Way, have you anticipated how you will accommodate the increase in traffic volume along Lake Washington Boulevard? You mentioned that Lake Washington Boulevard is already experiencing a significantly higher volume of traffic than had been originally planned for that street.
- Wilkenson:** Cars currently do not use Arboretum Way, trucks do because they cannot travel down Lake Washington Boulevard due to height restrictions. When Arboretum Way is closed, trucks will have to go down to 23rd Avenue, which was built to accommodate truck traffic.
- Foley:** Many of those trucks access the back of Broadmoor from Arboretum Way, as Broadmoor does not allow trucks access of Madison.
- Wilkenson:** Broadmoor will either have to change their policy, or trucks will have to go down to 23rd Avenue.
- Dubrow:** It appears that your public outreach highlighted the fear of violence and the desire for greater safety as a chief concern. To what degree can those issues be addressed in a physical master plan? Do you anticipate needing additional programs to address those issues?

- Wilkenson:** A ranger program has been discussed. The prime safety concern is that of car prowling. By designing safer parking lots that are bigger and thus have more surveillance, we are addressing that concern in the physical design.
- Dubrow:** There are currently a number of homeless people living on Foster Island. How do you plan to addressing that situation?
- Wilkenson:** At one point we spoke of re-instituting Fosters Camp, an idea that was negatively received. The homeless situation is not unique to Fosters Island - there are homeless people living in the bushes around Woodland Park Zoo.
- Dubrow:** Does your physical master plan include designs to remove the current homeless population?
- Wilkenson:** We recognize the problem, however it is beyond our purview to address the problem directly and programmatically.
- Swift:** I recently heard a disturbing statistic that 1 in 4 women are raped in the course of their life. I think that statistic gives weight and relevance to the safety issue you spoke of earlier, beyond the issue of car prowling.
- My second comment refers to the issue of governance. Could you please speak to the current agreement between the three parties, how it is functioning and plans for future governance structures?
- Wilkenson:** A governance Committee has been formed with representation from the University of Washington, the City of Seattle Parks Department and the Arboretum Foundation. The three parties now have a good working relationship, but that has not always been the case. Each party wants control, and each party wants to shift the financial responsibility to another party. We are currently looking for a mechanism that might make decision making easier.
- Darwish:** Will the creek you spoke of earlier be working with or against nature?
- Foley:** Most areas along the stream, especially along the lower half will be developed to emulate natural aquatic ecosystems. In addition, the master plan proposes to express the existing streams and connect them as part of a continuous, branching system.
- Layzer:** What kind of signage and universal access are you planning?
- Foley:** Part of the concept is to not rely so heavily on signs, but to make the path system more legible.
- Layzer:** Another aspect of the signage component is the understandability of the collection.
- Wilkenson:** There are so many different approaches to species identification. We are leaning towards a single relief sign per collection rather than the individual metal tags.
- Layzer:** Printing a book with descriptions of the collections could be a fund raising opportunity.
- Wilkenson:** There is already a book, which is rather expensive and difficult to understand.
- Dubrow:** I remain concerned that the issues of safety and violence have not been addressed head on. I would refer you to the writings of Gerda Wekerle, Faculty of Environmental Studies at York University in Toronto. She has written a great deal about dealing with those issues from an urban design perspective.
- Swift:** What happens next with the master plan?

**Wilkenson:** The plan will be finalized in the next 5 weeks, after which an EIS will be prepared. In order to perform an EIS, an alternative option is needed. Following the EIS, the master plan will be presented to City Council. Public hearings will follow.

**ACTION:** The Commission thanks the project manager for a thorough description of the status of the Arboretum master planning process, and offers the following comments, suggestions and observations:

- the Commission questions the adequacy to which the issue of safety has been addressed and recommends consulting the “Working Guide for Planning and Designing Safer Urban Environments”, produced by the City of Toronto,
- the Commission questions the use of undeveloped land for concession use and recommends using space that has already been developed to some extent, such as that near the existing visitor’s center,
- the Commission continues to be interested in the governance structure of the Arboretum and encourages a future structure that will ensure the maintenance of the collection, and
- the Commission continues to be interested in how Arboretum and public park activities can co-exist.

---

011697.2      Project: **SAKUMA VIEW POINT PARK**  
Phase: Schematics  
Presenters: Janet Doneldson, University of Washington  
Ed MacLeod, MacLeod Reckord Landscape Architects  
Lee Copeland, Weinstein Copeland Architects  
Doug Jennings, University of Washington  
Time: 0.75 hour (0.3%)

Sakuma View Point park is a public access component of the University’s Southwest Campus plan. The design is based on the existing park on Boat street overlooking Portage Bay between University Ave and Brooklyn Ave. The lawn area will be slightly decreased to allow for a paved area to the south wide enough to accommodate some furniture such as benches and picnic tables. A ramp will be built on the west side of the park to provide barrier free access from Boat Street down to the waterfront. A stairway will run along the east side of the park, alongside a building that will house a food concession. The top of the stairway will also serve as a look-out over the bay. The existing dock will be resurfaced as part of the project.

### **Discussion**

**Batra:** Will the marina walk be extended?

- Copeland:** The marina walk will continue to exist as it does today. There may be some improvements made in the future.
- Darwish:** Will there be anything done to slow down wheelchairs that might be using the ramp?
- MacLeod:** For every 30 inches of vertical drop, there will be a landing and handrails, as per code.
- Dubrow:** Are there artists involved in this project? If so, how will the art be handled, will it be retro-fitted to the design?
- MacLeod:** We recently met with two prospective artists, and are presently in the process of making a choice between the two. The first proposal involves a piece out on the water. The second is fit into the lawn structure. Hopefully we can get back in synch.
- Swift:** I have a few comments regarding the public access. The concession use of the waterfront codifies public access. In considering the nature of Boat Street, the presence of a food concession will give the public the sense that this park is open to them. The University of Washington is to be congratulated for balancing the public access needs and the programmatic and functional needs of the University. The manner in which you have resolved the marina walk makes a nice scale transition between the park open space and the smaller scale of the walk. My only concern is regarding the width of the stairs coming down from Boat Street. Given the southern exposure, I can see the stairs being used as a seating area. You might reconsider the width of the stairs.
- MacLeod:** We will do more studies regarding that matter. We definitely want the upper plaza to read both as an entry to the park, and as a use area.
- Sundberg:** There is something wonderful about the lack of budget that generated the original park. I think it is in part responsible for the simplicity of the design. I would encourage you to maintain a simple approach.
- Dubrow:** I appreciate the opening of the small waterfront structure and would encourage that its vernacular character be preserved. I hope that this is not a single example along the waterfront, but rather part of a rhythm.
- Layzer:** What kind of barrier free access are you providing to the concession area?
- Doneldson:** The upper floor will be directly accessible from the street and the lower level will be accessible from a parking lot to the east of the concession building.
- Batra:** I like the pedestrian access along Boat street. Will the presence of street trees block the view of the lake?
- MacLeod:** Those existing trees will frame views along Boat street.
- Foley:** I like what you have done with the design. The south facing park is so pleasant. The concept reminds me of Victor Steinbruek park, with a casual lawn seating area facing a nice view beyond a circulation walk. You earlier mentioned the angularity and rectilinear nature of the stairs and ramps. I like these forms except at the angle of the walk in the center, adjacent to the lawn. Putting a radius on that inside edge would seem more in keeping with the organic form of the lawn area. I know this is a fine point, perhaps a personal one.

**MacLeod:** We have heard that comment before - it is certainly a possibility.

**Dubrow:** I would also add that the juncture does not necessarily have to be lawn.

**Foley:** Often a lot of pesticides and fertilizers are used in the treatment of grass. Any time that can be avoided, particularly in cases where the lawn is adjacent to the waterfront; the better. I understand this is a question that extends beyond this project, but what are the policies of the University?

**Jennings:** I worked on the showboat beach project where the lawn sloped right down into the water. The maintenance personnel had an awareness of the fragility of the situation and we were told that any fertilizers used would be appropriate for that condition.

**Swift:** For someone who was introduced and cajoled into the profession by Don Sakuma, I think it is wonderful that the same firm who worked on the original park design is working on the revisions.

**Foley:** I greatly appreciate the level of information you presented today, and the fact that you allowed adequate time for Commissioner questions. Today's presentation would serve well as a model for project review presentations. Thank you.

**ACTION:** **The Design Commission recommends approval of the schematic phase as presented, with the following suggestions and comments:**

- **re-enforce the simplicity and serenity of the original park,**
- **refine the stair transition to allow for multiple use, and**
- **re-examine the angularity of the south end of the lawn.**

**Furthermore, the Commission commends the University of Washington's successful attempt to physically and programmatically weave public access into the design.**

---

011697.3      Project: **STONE VIEW VILLAGE**  
                    Phase: Schematics  
Presenters: John Hunt, Low Income Housing Institute  
                    Les Tonkin, Tonkin/Hoyne/Lokan  
                    Mike Moedritzer, Tonkin/Hoyne/Lokan  
                    Matthew Flickinger, Low Income Housing Institute  
Time: 1.25 hour (hourly)

The Low Income Housing Institute purchased 3 acres of land in Northwest Seattle and intends to develop the property into mixed income housing. The site is located on N 115 Street at Stone Avenue N. Within the immediate neighborhood are three large cemeteries, which provide visual open space. A Planned Unit Development is adjacent to the northern edge of the site, a Home Depot and an apartment complex lies to the west. Across the street to the south is a cemetery. The design team proposes to develop up to 180 units in three phases. The first phase will be units for working families at 50 to 80 % of median income. The second phase of housing will be for the elderly and the third phase will be market rate housing. The driving concept for the design

will be townhouses with separate entrances and as much private open space as possible. Some single flats will be tucked under the townhouses, taking advantage of the natural slope. The project has been through the first phase of neighborhood Design Review, where it received comments regarding the setback and the lack of uniformity in the design.

### **Discussion**

- Swift:** I think it is important for you to know that the Design Commission is conducting an evaluation of the Design Review process over the next few months, so you are likely to get a number of questions today regarding your experience going through the Design Review process.
- Wagoner:** Did the Design Review panel endorse the comments of the neighborhood?
- Hunt:** I think so, using words like “unify” and “contemporary northwest design”. What is awkward about the Design Review process is that we have to go to the first meeting as if we don’t have a design, but in order to receive funding we have to have a certain level of design. In addition, people are not satisfied with conceptual drawings and diagrams; they want to see more.
- Sundberg:** If one has not been trained to read conceptual drawings, they can be frustrating.
- Dubrow:** Are there major quality, detail, or design differences between the three phases of the project?
- Hunt:** The only difference is the provision of more parking (located underground) and an elevator in the market rate building.
- Dubrow:** If phase two does not get funding, what will happen to that portion of the site?
- Hunt:** If that were to happen we would probably re-apply for funding, if unsuccessful move towards market rate units. If neither of those options were successful, we would probably have to sell that parcel.
- Dubrow:** Ideally, what would you like from us in terms of support?
- Hunt:** We would love it if you liked what we have done so far.
- Tonkin:** If you see flaws in the design, or in the design review process, those are comments we would appreciate hearing.
- We anticipated the reaction of the neighborhood, to a certain degree. In a way, they have not reacted too differently from what we had expected. The comments of the neighborhood, however, are rather difficult to interpret.
- Foley:** I think there are two issues which the Commission needs to address; that of the setback and that of the “unifying” feature.
- Tonkin:** There is a difference between elements that unify and those that distinguish. The biggest issue for us is how to interpret the phrase “uniformity”.
- Batra:** Your project has three major components to be completed in three phases, for three separate groups of users. I wonder what drove you to build the low income family portion of the project at the corner 115th Avenue and Stone Way, instead of placing it in the middle of the site?
- Moedritzer:** We related less to the street than to the proximity to the Home Depot. We wanted to place the family housing as far from that blank facade as possible and also provide the maximum southern exposure.

**Tonkin:** All units are oriented inward, not out towards 115th. Citywalk also has apartments that face the street but are oriented inward.

**Swift:** The organization of the site plan shows clear transitions between the public and private zones. The parking as you have organized it, works. The amount of open space and scale of the trees is appropriate to the surrounding context of the cemeteries.

Regarding the uniformity issue, I think your options are to; 1) treat the building uniformly, akin to a large scale strip development, or 2) break down the scale of the buildings and bring it down to a neighborhood scale. There are many tools available to break down the scale, one of which is paint.

**Darwish:** Are the three projects going to be built in three phases? If so, why?

**Hunt:** The phases are funding related rather than time related. The center portion will probably happen last in the sequence.

**Darwish:** Will your handicap accessible units be in the basement?

**Tonkin:** We are using the grade to our advantage. The units will be accessible on grade, but part of the units will be tucked into the grade.

**Dubrow:** Have you given any consideration to mother-in-law apartments for your single units rather than package them as separate units?

Regarding the facades, I would urge you to articulate the unique corners of the buildings rather than implement intense facade screening.

**Foley:** The massing of the building relates to the scale of the context but not to the scale of the user. There is a need for articulation. Could you please explain the need for the amount of fencing you are showing?

**Tonkin:** Sometimes we use a fence between buildings for security, sometimes we don't close fences. Fences are items that often drop out of a design in later stages.

**Hunt:** Some of the lines you see on the site plan are symbolic. They are used to define the open space for the individual units. We would like to have privacy screens on the side. In addition, we need a fence across the edge of the cemetery.

**Foley:** Philosophically, my preference is not to have fences. Given your experience, however, they might be necessary to fulfill a functional requirement. It is actually the internal fences within the property that I am reacting to. Perhaps through careful manipulation of the grade, in conjunction with strategic placement of a few plants, you can develop the sense of private versus public space.

**Dubrow:** The fence issue remains unresolved. We need a clearer sense of what is intended, given how the fence line dominates the site plan.

**Layzer:** I am not sure I agree. I think definition of private space is desirable, perhaps with landscaping and rockery as opposed to fencing.

**Dubrow:** We are looking for the use of a wider range of tools to define the private and public space.

**Swift:** Those could be presented at the next review.

**Foley:** You are proposing a mixed income community, which is great. The next step in that process is not to segregate the kinds of units by blocks. Is that possible given the financing and market conditions?



- Hunt:** No, it is too risky. We are heavily reliant on tax credit financing.
- Tonkin:** The particular funding package that we are working with is very strict.
- Moedritzer:** In our past work with the Seattle Housing Authority, we have been told that residents really prefer fences. We are trying to be responsive to those preferences.
- Tonkin:** The Housing Authority is concerned with the responsibility factor. If you have a fence around an area, that area falls into the responsibility of the respective unit resident.
- Dubrow:** I like the overall site plan, but I would suggest re-thinking the entry sequence to these units. The back door is the principle entrance but is not treated as the principal entrance. I would think that more refinement, the design will start to fit the site better.
- Tonkin:** We are using housing types that we have successfully used before.
- Dubrow:** Why are you designing the main entries as back doors?
- Tonkin:** We have to make the entries work both ways. The front door entries are ceremonial in nature. The units themselves are fairly small. We could reverse the floor plan and make an interior street, but you would still need a ceremonial entry on the street.
- Layzer:** I really appreciate the organization of the parking and the open space. I think you have provided great access to people on foot as well as in automobiles. I also greatly appreciate the multi-generation and mixed income character of the project. Is there a possibility of moving the elderly housing closer to the family housing?
- Hunt:** That is a delicate residential relationship. We prefer to locate the elderly housing at the edge of the family housing so the elderly can have visual contact, but not be disturbed.
- Swift:** We still have not addressed the issues raised by the Design Review board. Those are: setback, uniformity, and I would add, breakdown of project scale.
- Hunt:** Conceptually I question the right of the City to insist on a style in an area that is not architecturally strong.
- Dubrow:** Another way to look at that is the expression of concern for a project that looks like it was designed for another place.
- Foley:** I would recommend compliance with the code regarding the setbacks, with some minimal screening.
- Dubrow:** I would strongly second the setback requirement, but not the screening requirement. Instead I would encourage moving towards a stronger design.
- Hunt:** The phrase "related as a single project" is problematic to us. Some people think that means paint it all one color.
- Batra:** Won't the three projects, in their design, look different?
- Hunt:** They will be different forms, but we could go further.
- Dubrow:** What I see presented is an overly uniform design, rather than one that is too disparate. I would lean towards a recommendation that you use a wide range of design tools to distinguish and differentiate the buildings, bringing them down to a human scale. I am concerned that there not be an overt distinction between the three projects.

**Darwish:** Could we see the colors you are considering at the next presentation?

**Hunt:** Do we have to come before this group before we go back before the Design Review board?

**Wagoner:** That may be advisable, as we might be able to offer comments of support prior to your decision meeting with the Design Review board. In addition, the Design Commission is advisory to City staff, including the Design Review staff at DCLU.

**Foley:** We strongly support what you are trying to do and we are trying to help you get through the process. Perhaps a representative from the Design Review Board can attend your next presentation before this body. This may simplify, clarify, or coordinate the comments to which you must respond.

**ACTION:** The Commission recommends approval of schematics as presented with the following comments and suggestions:

- follow the code required setbacks, and
- in response to the degree of uniformity indicated in the drawings, the Commission encourages the design team to distinguish and articulate the design by responding to the individual site conditions and orientation.

The Commission requests a greater amount of detail to be presented at the next review pertaining to the outside public and private space, the floor plans, the color and site plan including topography. The Commission commends the project team on an excellent mix of age, economic status and family type.

---

011697.4

#### COMMISSION BUSINESS

- A. MINUTES OF DECEMBER 19, 1996 Approved as amended.
- B. DESIGN REVIEW EVALUATION Methods of evaluation were discussed. A subcommittee of Darwish and Foley will meet with staff on January 30 to further develop evaluation tools.
- D. RETREAT A draft of the 1997 Design Commission goals was distributed for comment. The 1997 Design Commission goals will be finalized at the February 6 meeting.
- E. CONSULTANT SELECTION: LINCOLN RESERVOIR AND OPERA HOUSE Batra and Dubrow will serve on the Lincoln Reservoir project. Sundberg will serve on the Opera House project.
- F. MUNI CENTER UPDATE Wagoner reported.

G. ENVIRONMENTAL LEARNING CENTER UPDATE Sundberg and Foley reported.

011697.5                      **WEST LAKE UNION CORRIDOR**  
Working Session  
Time: 0.45 hour (N/C)

Commissioners and staff discussed the form and content of the report on the West Lake Union Corridor Working Session held in November.

011697.6	Project: <b>WASHINGTON STATE TRADE AND CONVENTION CENTER EXPANSION</b>  Phase: Update Presenters: Matt Lampe, Department of Administrative Services Chuck Hartung, Project Manager Chris Eseman, Loschky, Marquardt and Nesholm Robben Mayer, Loschky, Marquardt and Nesholm Jerry Heron, RC Hedreen Jerry Gerron, G2 Architecture  Time: 1.5 hour (0.3%)
----------	---

The expansion of the Washington State Trade and Convention Center will increase the exhibit space of the center by 100,000 square feet, allowing the center to meet the needs of 80% of the trade and convention market. Currently the center can serve 50% of the market. The increase in exhibit space will allow not only for larger shows, but for simultaneous use of the facility by smaller shows. Two alternatives were explored by the design team and taken through the EIS process; an expansion to the east and an expansion to the north. The north alternative was the preferred alternative. In order to provide the continuous exhibit space, it will be necessary to bridge over Pike Street. Two wide skybridges are proposed, one for pedestrians and the other for service. These bridges will be enclosed by a translucent arcade, providing raincover to the street below while allowing visual and light penetration. Care has been taken to ensure that the pedestrian character of Pike street is maintained and enhanced through street level use and interesting facades. The hotel proposed for the northern section of the site has decreased in size from 1,000 rooms to 400 rooms. This will result in a slightly smaller overall building mass.

## Discussion

**Layzer:** How do you maintain a glass arcade?

**Eseman:** We are looking into that. There are European models that we can study. Buses are certainly a concern.

**Dubrow:** Are there any alternative solutions to the service skybridge?

**Eseman:** We looked at ramps, but they took up the whole site.

- Lampe:** Currently none of the trucks that service the convention center need to ever enter the downtown street grid. It is desirable to keep the disruption to traffic flow minimal.
- Layzer:** I am still trying to imagine the impact of a 90 foot wide floor coming through the middle of a glass arcade.
- Sundberg:** The European models you referenced earlier have scale and context. I would encourage you to look at the scale and context of this building and arcade. Just looking at the model - the building mass is so large.
- Swift:** The urban design team of Mark Hinshaw and Ellen Sollod focused so much on the pedestrian scale in their analysis of the expansion. I am assuming that will continue to be a focus as the design moves forward.
- Darwish:** Your drawings show Pike as a two-way street. Will that happen?
- Lampe:** There was some discussion of that possibility and it has been left as a possibility in the EIS.
- Foley:** Is there a sense of the percentage of people who will arrive on foot versus that of whom will arrive via auto?
- Lampe:** A pretty small number will arrive other than by foot from surrounding hotels. The current convention center was designed based on a low percentage of people arriving via automobiles. The actual number is in fact even lower.
- Foley:** Is there any need for parking, or for a drop-off zone? If so, Pine street might become a second entrance.
- Lampe:** Clearly the retail and hotel have traffic impacts. There will be a drop-off zone on Pine for the hotel. The challenge is to design an entry and a drop-off for the hotel in conjunction with designing the same for the convention center.  
I would also like to point out that the arcade bridge is a distinct space within a room. There is no vertical circulation on the northern block
- Swift:** At the last presentation of this project, the Design Commission supported the proposed skybridges with some concerns about the pedestrian scale. We were assured that pedestrian scaling would occur. How is your budget, and will these concerns still be addressed?
- Eseman:** Pedestrian scaling is still a high priority for the design and it will continue to be so. Our budget is not any less than the last time we presented before the Commission.
- Dubrow:** At what point can we expect to see those concerns addressed in the physical design?
- Hartung:** We are just at the beginning of schematics.
- Swift:** I really appreciate the thorough briefing you have made to us today. What is your projected schedule?
- Hartung:** We will be moving towards design development in mid-April and onto construction documents in July. We are planning on starting construction in the summer of 1998.
- Lampe:** I think returning before this group at the end of schematics would be timely.
- Sundberg:** Does the access bridge have to be that wide?
- Layzer:** I was going to ask if it had to be wider.

- Eseman:** We laid out the width in the Kingdome to test the maneuverability. We found that there is actually room to turn a truck around on the bridge at its current width. The bridge could not be any narrower, as the trucks need that width for reverse turns.
- Lampe:** The layout of truck parking spaces has changed to the benefit of the truck drivers.
- Sundberg:** Should the design of the service bridge mimic that of the pedestrian bridge?
- Layzer:** I wonder about the impact of trucks overhead on pedestrians on the street.
- Dubrow:** I for one, would feel very uncomfortable being under a bridge with trucks overhead.
- Eseman:** I guess the it is sort of like a viaduct, however the bridge will be significantly higher than any other truck overpass. Regarding the relationship of the two bridges, this group recommended a pair of bridges, as opposed to many bridges or two different bridges.
- Dubrow:** Would a conveyor belt fulfill service needs?
- Lampe:** Trucks now load and unload on the exhibit space floor.
- Layzer:** Regarding the set back of the hotel on the northwest corner; what sort of impact does that have on the pedestrian environment?
- Heron:** We want the hotel to be a statement that comes down to the ground - that has street presence. We also want to give the convention center as much uninterrupted exhibit space as possible, so we moved the hotel tower to the northwest corner. On the ground level we want each storefront to be as individual as possible.
- Swift:** What is happening on 8th Avenue?
- Heron:** An idea that has been forwarded is to use that area for transportation services, such as an Airporter stop and rental car agencies, given the proximity to the Metro tunnel.
- Layzer:** Can you ever have two 100 square foot conventions as opposed to one 200 sq. ft. convention?
- Eseman:** Yes. One of the primary goals of the project was to design space that could be provide simultaneous operation.
- Dubrow:** How has the inclusion of art been thus handled?
- Lampe:** One of the Convention Center board members is a strong arts advocate.
- Dubrow:** I think a lot of the tone of the design is set in schematics. Involving artists early , and beyond a narrow interpretation of public art would greatly benefit the project.
- Wagoner:** Who is in charge of administrating the art in this project?
- Hartung:** The State of Washington.
- Dubrow:** Hopefully at the next presentation, we can see how the art has been integrated with the design.
- Swift:** We look forward to your next presentation. Thank you again for such a thorough presentation of the project to date.
- ACTION:** No action taken, update only.